REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, and 14 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-20 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 7-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russel-Falla in view of Weiser in further view of Chakrabarti. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) Russel-Falla in view of Weiser in further view of Chakrabarti in further view of "Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0." Russell-Falla teaches blocking the display of a web page (or other digital record) from a search engine link that contains a particular type of content. Weiser teaches integrating a headerless apparatus into a messaging environment. Chakrabarti teaches a web crawler that that a topic-specific library for user search. Doerre teaches generating a content taxonomy of electronic documents.

With respect to independent claims 1, 7, and 14, the Examiner states on Page 4 of the Office Action, "Doerre also teaches incorporating said concept in a conceptual model at least in part by using said concept type identification (column 4, lines 31-67; column 5, lines 1-56: i.e. the feature vector calculated for the newly routed document was utilized in conjunction with the taxonomy to incorporate the concept into a predefined concept cluster or into it's own original cluster newly created within the taxonomy)." Hence the Examiner equates the "conceptual model" of the claims to the Doerre's "concept cluster" or "cluster newly created within the taxonomy." The "concept cluster" of Doerre is included in the taxonomy of Doerre (Col 5, lines 29-56). Doerre does not teach incorporating the concept in a conceptual model at least in part by using the concept type identification, "wherein the conceptual model is not included in the conceptual taxonomy" as amended in claims 1, 7, and 14.

Additionally, the Examiner states on Pages 5-6 of the Office Action "Chakrabarti et al teach wherein the search query was associated with said concept type identification... ; identifying said concept at least in part by using said concept identification of said search query...; utilizing the conceptual model... to determine that said document was associated with said identified concept...; and concluding at least in part on the determination that said document was associated with said identified concept, that said document was responsive to said search query..." Chakrabarti does not teach the search query of Chakrabarti is associated with the

"concept type identification" that is used to explicitly identify the "concept" determined, using the "conceptual model", to be associated with the "document" as recited in claims 1, 7, and 14. Although Chakrabarti does teach building a database of web pages focused on a predefined topic or topics, the predefined topic or topics is not used to explicitly identify a concept that is determined, using a conceptual model, to be associated with a document. As such, claims 1, 7, and 14 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 8-13 depend from claim 7, and claims 15-20 depend from claim 14 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6 / 18 / 07

Jong Andrew H. Park
Registration No. 56,917
V   408-973-2577
F   408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014